

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are currently pending. Claim 7 is withdrawn from consideration due to the restriction requirement of June 15, 2007.

In the non-final Office Action: Claims 1-3, 4, and 6 were rejected under 36 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murai (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0008743) in view of Hashizume et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,089,701) and Ito et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0036678). Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murai in view of Hashizume et al. and Ito et al. in view of Nishi et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0011660).

In reply to the rejection of claims 1-3, 4, and 6 were rejected under 36 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murai in view of Hashizume et al. and Ito et al., the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1-3, 4, and 6 recite "...an ink-supplying portion formed by a through-hole ...through the actuator portion..."

Murai relates to a piezoelectric element, as specified in the title. As stated on page 3 of the Office Action, "Murai does not teach ... an ink supplying portion formed by a through-hole ... through the actuator portion..."

Hashizume et al. relates to an ink jet recording head, as specified in the title. Hashizume et al. does not teach or suggest "...an ink-supplying portion formed by a through-hole ...through the actuator portion..." Further, the Office Action does not purport that Hashizume et al. teaches or suggests "...an ink-supplying portion formed by a through-hole ...through the actuator portion..."

Ito et al. relates to laminated and bonded construction of thin plate parts, as specified in the title. The Office Action purports on page 4, lines 5-12 that "Ito teaches ... an ink-supplying portion formed by a through-hole ...through the actuator portion..." at Figure 5, item 17. However, Ito et al. does not disclose a through hole through an actuator. In fact, Figure 6 of Ito et al. very clearly shows that through hole 17 is below actuator 20. Further, it appears that through hole 17 is part of an ink passage portion and not an ink supplying portion, as recited in the claims.

Accordingly, a *prima facie* case of obvious has not been established in the rejection of claims 1-3, 4, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) because neither Murai, Hashizume et al, nor Ito et al. teach or suggest, alone or in combination all of the claim recitations. At least for this reason, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

In reply to the rejection of claim 5 were rejected under 36 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murai in view of Hashizume et al. and Ito et al. and Nishi et al., the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claim 5 recites "...an ink-supplying portion formed by a through-hole ...through the actuator portion...", which is discussed above in relation to the rejection of claims 1-3, 4, and 6. As discussed above, neither Murai, Hashizume et al., nor Ito et al. teach or suggest this claim recitation.

Nishi et al. relates to a method of manufacturing an ink-jet head, as specified in the title. Nishi et al. does not teach or suggest "...an ink-supplying portion formed by a through-hole ...through the actuator portion..." Further, the Office Action does not purport that Nishi et al. teaches or suggests "...an ink-supplying portion formed by a

through-hole ...through the actuator portion..." Accordingly, Nishi et al. does not alleviate the deficiencies of Murai, Hashizume et al., and Ito et al. of not teaching or suggesting these claim recitation.

Accordingly, a *prima facie* case of obvious has not been established in the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) because neither Murai, Hashizume et al, Ito et al., nor Nishi et al. teach or suggest, alone or in combination all of the claim recitations. At least for this reason, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action and respectfully submits that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D H Sherr', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Daniel H. Sherr
Reg. No. 46,425

Sherr & Nourse, PLLC
620 Herndon Parkway
Suite 200
Herndon, Virginia 20170
Tel: 703-673-1141
Fax: 703-935-8473
DHS/tljw